DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 624 EA 020 283

AUTHOR Campbell, Roald F.
TITLE How Well Does the "Handbook" Fulfill Its Historical Mission?
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; *Administrator Education; Administrator Role; *Educational Administration; *Educational Research; Higher Education

ABSTRACT

The "Handbook," a review designed to present the best of educational administration research from the 1950s to the 1980s, is examined to determine how reasonable it was to limit the coverage to these 30 years, how well the publication covered the major topics during the chosen time frame, and how well it included the major contributors in the field. The limits placed upon the time scope of the "Handbook" are dealt with in terms of the major researchers and theories that are left out, but which had definite impact upon current thinking. How well the review covers the 30-year period is examined next. Comparison is made between the recognized theories in the field and those included in this work. This cross-check is accomplished in several ways; the determination is made that the latter years of the period are covered well, but the earlier years show some lack of coverage. Morever, an examination of the contributors, who number 102, reveals that several important researchers are missing, while several less well-established professionals are included. Lists are appended with names of the 43 major contributors and the 50 recommended experts in the field. References are included. (LMS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298624

HOW WELL DOES THE HANDBOOK FULFILL ITS HISTORICAL MISSION?

Roald F. Campbell

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 5-9, 1988

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Campbell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 020 283

HOW WELL DOES THE HANDBOOK FULFILL ITS HISTORICAL MISSION?*

Roald F. Campbell

I have been asked to consider how well the Handbook fulfills it's historical mission. There could be some relationship between my age and my assignment. I have been at this a long time. I hope, however, that I can bring more than longevity to this discussion.

Perhaps I may be forgiven for suggesting that in the 1950s I participated in a project somewhat like the production of this Handbook. I speak of Administrative Behavior in Education, a report that occupied 18 professors for about three years and was organized and edited by Russell Gregg and myself (Campbell and Gregg, 1957). While much more modest than the current work, Administrative Behavior in Education did, at that time, set a kind of benchmark in the field, as has been noted in several chapters in the Handbook. My experience with the earlier project, gives me additional reason to commend those who have worked long and hard to produce the Handbook. I agree with Willower who noted that the Handbook is, "the most ambitious and comprehensive of reviews, yearbooks, and encyclopedias that have been published on the subject" (Handbook, p. 729).

Let me be more specific in my commendation. I note that there are 44 authors and 61 consultant-reviewers, a total of 105 with an overlap of three people. We thus have 102 very active participants in the writing end of this project. Think of the requests, the confirmations, the directions, the queries, the reminders that it took to get and keep that many prima donnas at work. Somewhere in this process and often at several points there was the problem of securing a publisher. Finally, with much effort and much time a

---

*Prepared for American Educational Research Association, April, 1988.

publishable draft emerged. At that point, working with the publisher became intensified. Finally, the document was published. After all of this effort here we are ready to subject the result to professional criticism. Before I participate in that exercise, however, let me once again congratulate Norman Boyan and his many colleagues on the job they have done.

Back to my assignment, how well does the Handbook serve its historical mission? To be more specific and to use the language of the Preface, how well does the Handbook present the "'normal science' that has prevailed in driving inquiry in educational administration over the past 30 years?" To provide an answer to this question, it seemed that I must first develop some criteria and then determine to what extent each criterion had been met. A number of criteria came to mind but I decided to accept only two as shown:

1. How well does the Handbook cover the time period, the 1950's to the 1980s?
2. How well does the Handbook include the major scholarly contributors to the field in that period?

The question of how well the Handbook covers the time period needs to be divided into two parts: What may have been missed in focusing the Handbook, as noted in the introduction, on the last 30 years? And how well does the Handbook cover research on administration since the mid-1950s?

TIME I

With respect to the first question, I recognize the need that the editors had to set some limits for their work. And, except for Chapter 1 on the intellectual history of the field, there is little explicit attention paid to any work done before the 1950s. I recognize, however, that knowledge is cumulative and early research may have influenced inquiry over the past 30

years more than is apparent. Even so, lest such a delimitation be seen as suggesting there was no research prior to that time I must provide some examples of early research. It seems notable to me that the precursor of the American Educational Research Association was organized in 1915 under the name of the National Association of Directors of Research. These directors came largely from city school systems with a few directors coming from newly-formed bureaus of educational research recently established in such places as the University of Illinois and Ohio State University. In 1920 that organization, even though only 67 strong, began publication of the Journal of Educational Research. In volume 1 of the new journal its mission was set forth. A part of that statement follows:

> The Journal of Educational Research will be devoted to the uses which have been made and are capable of being made of the results and methods of investigation. It will emphasize applications rather than abstractions, and practice rather than theory. It will not avoid the theoretical altogether, and it will present some technical articles. But such articles will be most welcome when they have obvious practical implications. Research for the sake of research we shall leave for others. What uses the teacher and supervisor have made or may make of the findings of the experimentalist, what methods are transferable from the laboratory to the classroom and office, what workable means of meeting common needs have been developed under actual school conditions--these will be our chief concern (Buckingham, 1920, p. 1).

Also instructive is citation of some of the articles in the first volume, as noted below:

> The Use of Intelligence Tests in the Grading of School Children - Lewis M. Terman
>
> The Self-Survey in the Elementary School: An Experiment in Cooperation - R. H. Lane
>
> A State-Wide School-Building Survey - George D. Strayer
>
> Intelligence Examinations for College Entrance - Edward L. Thorndike

A New Method of Rating Teachers - Wm. L. Connor

Common School Finance in Colorado and Certain Influences of National Import - Fletcher Harper Swift

Comparative Results in Intermediate and Elementary Schools at Los Angeles - Thomas H. Briggs

One would have had a hard time convincing Terman, Strayer, Thorndike, Swift, and Briggs that they were not doing research. Indeed, those of us who completed our doctorates in the 1940s came to recognize such names as the giant scholars in the field.

Another notable movement prior to the 1950s was the advent of the school survey. Caswell examined the school survey movement and identified 181 such studies of city school systems between 1910 and 1927 (Caswell, 1931). A notable example was the Cleveland School Survey conducted in 1915 and 1916, under the direction of Leonard P. Ayers of the Russell Sage Foundation. Other staff members included Franklin Bobbitt and Charles Judd of the University of Chicago, Walter Jessup of the University of Iowa, and many others not as well known. The study was reported in 23 monographs and a summary volume (Ayers, 1917). Separate monographs dealt with such topics as child accounting, the teaching staff, what the schools teach, measuring the work of the schools, school buildings and equipment, financing the schools, and school organization and administration. In each case there was a factual examination of what existed, problems encountered, and recommendations made for improvement. While recommendations were obviously normatively based, one can hardly say that these investigators were not doing research. Moreover, as Caswell observed these studies made a real difference in practice.

Of interest, too, is the fact that the Cleveland Survey led to the organization of the Cleveland Conference, an annual meeting, initially

attended by the survey staff to note follow-up efforts in Cleveland and consider other educational developments. Gradually other participants were admitted to the Cleveland Conference and its agenda was changed to consider emerging issues in education. That conference persists to this day and provides a stimulating session of two or three days annually for those who attend.

Still another example of pre-1950 research is found in the founding of a second journal in the field, The Review of Educational Research which appeared in 1931 and was sponsored by the American Educational Research Association, the new and still the name of the organization. Again, a sample of topics and authors from the first volume is instructive:

The Curriculum
- Ralph Tyler and Edgar Dale
  Bureau of Educational Research
  The Ohio State University

Teacher Personnel
- E. T. Peterson
  University of Iowa
- Ward Reeder
  Ohio State University

School Organization
- W. C. Reavis
  University of Chicago
- Paul Rankin
  Detroit Schools

Methods in the Elementary School
- Frederick Breed and
  William S. Gray
  University of Chicago

With this new journal the practice of repeating topics on a three-year cycle began. Many of us learned to live by those triennial reviews (Review of Educational Research, 1931).

Nor can I let this occasion go by without reminding us about the Eight Year Study. Sponsored by the Progressive Education Association, organized by the Commission on the Relation of School and College, and under the direction of Wilford M. Aikin, this study was a major event of the 1930s and the summary report appeared in 1942 (Aiken). In brief the academic records of graduates of 32 high schools were examined over a period of eight years, four in high school and four in college, to determine the relationship, if any, between high school performance and college performance. The study is noteworthy in a number of ways: it is one of the few longitudinal studies in education, director of the evaluation staff was none other than Ralph W. Tyler, and its findings were rather surprising. For instance, "The assumption that preparation for the liberal arts college depends upon the study of certain prescribed subjects in the secondary school is no longer tenable" (Aikin, p. 118). In short, it was not the pattern of courses that made the difference in college achievement, rather it was how well students did in whatever they took. One cannot resist wishing that authors of recent reform reports had done a little home work.

There is still one more phenomenon characteristic of that ancient pre-1950 world that might be noted. With colleagues, I have recently dealt with the history of thought in educational administration (Campbell et al, 1980). We noted the advent of Taylorism and scientific management in industry. But there was also an indigenous development in education, the scientific movement of which surveys and tests were expressions. We noted, too, the Hawthorne studies and the subsequent development of human relations in industry. Again, while not identical, there was a similar movement in education, the exposition

of democratic administration. These two frames of thought obviously influenced much of the research done before the 1950s.

What then is our answer to the first question, how well were we served by the imposition of the 30-year limit? My short answer is that it may have been an unfortunate, even if a necessary delimitation. Perhaps those who imposed the limitation tended to equate research with the development of theory and theory-based research and made the decision too readily.

TIME II

We come now to the second question, how well does the Handbook cover inquiry over the last 30 years? I know of no way by which a precise answer can be had to that question. Some evidence on the matter will be compiled by means of three procedures: a cross-check of leading scholars over the period, a consideration of how social movements over the period have been reflected, and an examination of how professional developments over the 30 years have been recognized.

With respect to a cross-check of leading scholars, three devices have been tried. The first of these is to note how many of the 18 professors who produced Administrative Behavior in Education in 1957, have been recognized in the Handbook. Of the 18, four appear in the Handbook: Russell Gregg, Dan Griffiths, Andrew Halpin, and myself. Of the 14 who do not appear in the Handbook there seems cause to wonder about some of them. For instance, Cyril Sargent and Eugene Belisle had done some very useful work on concepts of administration and case study instruction, Orin Graff and Calvin Street were among the first to deal with the philosophy of administration, and Kenneth McIntyre did a number of studies in the area of selection. While one must recognize that some knowledge is more enduring than other knowledge, these

scholars and perhaps others and their work may have been passed over too lightly.

Another device for cross-checking scholars was to note the leading contributors selected by Culbertson for the last two periods of his intellectual history and see how many of them made the Handbook. In the 1951-66 period Culbertson focused on the work of J. W. Getzels, Griffiths, and Halpin. Each of these scholars and their work is treated generously in the Handbook. An entire chapter was devoted to the Getzels models, Getzels himself served as a reviewer of the chapter, and some 15 references were made to his work. Griffiths served as the author of one chapter and 23 references were made to his work. Halpin, even though he has not been active for two decades, was referenced some 21 times. As representatives of the so-called theory movement of the 1950s these scholars have been heard.

For the period 1967-85, Culbertson focused on R. J. Bates, W. P. Foster, T. B. Greenfield, and once again Griffiths. In the Handbook Bates is given four references, Foster three, Greenfield 15, and Griffiths, as noted above, is clearly a major contributor. Greenfield "fired the short heard round the world" but he seems to have extended his inquiry little since then. Bates and Foster also appear, to this point, to be better critics than researchers. Hence, again the Handbook seems to have given these scholars their due.

As a third procedure in cross checking scholars of research articles in the Educational Administration Quarterly, sample volumes for ~~the~~ each five years 1965, ~~1970, 1975, and 1979~~ 1980 were noted (the 1980 volume was checked out of the library). In all, there were 73 articles by 60 authors. I then placed these 60 scholars along side my master list of contributors to the Handbook, a total of 223 scholars, to determine how much overlap there was (compilation of the master

list is explained later). Only 20 of these authors appeared in my master list for the Handbook. While it is impossible to establish a norm for a thing of this kind, on the face of it to have only a third of the contributors to EAQ over its years of publication, all within the 30-year period, called upon to make contributions to the Handbook suggests a possible breakdown in coverage. To be sure some scholars first identified in EAQ persisted into the Handbook. Notable among these are Edwin Bridges, Griffiths, James Guthrie, and Donald Willower. It seems strange, however, that Terry Geske in finance, and Emil Haller and Larry Hughes in organizational analysis did not make the Handbook, and that Jean Hills with his work on Parsons made it only by one reference. Perhaps major contributors to the Handbook overlooked too readily the work of the four scholars noted above.

Recognizing that these cross-checking devices are crude measures, it may still be suggestive that in two of the three cross-checks some question about adequate coverage of the last 30 years was raised.

On the assumption that social movements affect educational thought and practice, hence research about thought and practice, we turn next to a consideration of the extent to which social movements over the past 30 years were reflected in the Handbook. The major social movement of the time appears to have been the civil rights revolution cast large with the Brown decision, followed by civil rights legislation, and then court action to insure the rights of minorities and women. Closely related to civil rights and exacerbated by the unfortunate war in Vietnam was the youth movement. Does the Handbook reflect adequately these social upheavals? The answer seems to be yes. Chapter 6 is focused on women, chapter 7 on race, and chapter 8 on equity. These chapters seem to deal forthrightly with the studies made in

those domains. Chapter 10 deals with pupil control studies but is focused more narrowly on school discipline than on the larger consideration of the youth rebellion.

Three major educational historians have dealt with the last 30 or 40 years. David Tyack and Elisabeth Hansot in the last third of their Managers of Virtue refer to the period as "Dreams Deferred, 1954-?" (Tyack and Hansot, 1982). They recognize that educators, like people generally, are confused with the protest movements, a growing lack of consensus, and the need for a new coherence and sense of commitment. The Handbook contains four references to this volume and two additional ones to other work by Tyack.

The other insightful treatment of education during this period is The Troubled Crusade by Diane Ravitch (Ravitch, 1983). Useful chapters deal with the Brown decision, the student revolt, and the new politics of education. For some reason, writers of the Handbook made not a single reference to Ravitch. Perhaps this omission and modest reference to Tyack and Hansot suggest that historical research resides a bit out of the mainstream for scholars in educational administration.

We turn next to developments in professional education over the past 30 years and a consideration of how those developments have been recognized in the Handbook. The major developments appear to be the following: the evolution of the concept of the school as an open institution, very dependent on its environment; the advent of teacher negotiations, their rise and modification; the blossoming of policy studies; the popularity of culture as a framework for understanding schools and other organizations; and finally the movement toward alternate research paradigms--phenomenological, ethnological, marxist, and most prominently qualitative research. It seems clear that these

five developments are not entirely discrete, hence their consideration in the Handbook is often joined.

The Handbook appears to reflect generously these professional developments. Many of these themes are integrated with more comprehensive treatments in four of the chapters: Chapter 1 on history, Chapter 2 on theory, Chapter 4 on administrator behavior, and Chapter 9 on the Getzels models. Another group of chapters focus on the school as a workplace: Chapter 11 on structural constraints, Chapter 12 on power and authority, Chapter 14 on motivation, Chapter 16 on change, and Chapter 17 on school effects. Policy and policy studies are the focus of five chapters, 21 through 25. There is a separate chapter on negotiations and one on field work. Finally, in Chapter 33 Willower has identified six trends that characterize the Handbook. Three of these--focus on people, values, and philosophy--have direct relevance to the professional developments noted above.

What then is our answer with respect to how well the Handbook covers the research of the last 30 years? My attempt at cross checking scholars over that period, even though a crude measure, suggested some lack of coverage. As a reflection of the major social movements, time II seemed more adequately covered but with historical evidence partially ignored. In terms of recognizing professional developments over the last few decades, the Handbook appears to meet the time criterion most adequately.

CONTRIBUTORS

We turn next to how well the Handbook included the scholarly contributors to the field. Again, there is no precise answer to the question. I have done some manipulating with the names of contributors, as will now be explained. To begin with, I assumed that authors and joint authors of chapters in the

Handbook were scholarly contributors, that consultant-reviewers were scholarly contributors, and that any person whose work had been referenced three or more times, as shown in the Name Index, was a scholarly contributor. Using these criteria, I found that there were 223 scholarly contributors to the Handbook.

I ran into one problem with the Name Index. Textual references to the work of authors are shown by page numbers. However, not all the references to authors shown at the end of chapters are given page numbers. For instance, following the name of Edwin Bridges in the Name Index there are nine page references to his work. But by looking at the references at the end of each chapter, one finds five additional references--pages 70, 275, 318, 672, and 701--for which no page numbers are shown in the Name Index. At best then, the page citations following each author in the Name Index are a rather shaky criterion. However, not having a professional indexer at hand, I have used the page citations as shown in the Name Index as one criterion for placement on the list of 223 scholarly contributors.

Coping with 223 contributors seemed difficult, hence I sought a way of reducing that number to major contributors. I assigned weights to each type of contribution to the Handbook, 20 for author of a chapter, 10 for joint author; 10 for reviewer of a chapter; and five for each page citation shown in the Name Index. Using these weights, I found that authors earned scores ranging from 10 to 135. By arbitrarily selecting a score of 35 as a cut off point, I reduced contributors from 223 to 43. These 43 I have called the major contributors to the Handbook and their names are shown in Appendix A.

I then decided to conduct a simple reputation survey regarding these names. I selected 10 professors, well known in the field, to serve as jurors. These jurors are all still active; three are among the 43 contributors, four

others are among the 223 contributors, and three are not on either list; each of the 10 is at a different university, all regions in the U. S. and one in Canada are represented; most of the jurors are full professors but some are at junior levels. I called each juror by telephone, explained my procedure, and asked whether each of the 43 major contributors to the Handbook was, in the juror's judgment, a major scholarly contributor to the field over the last 30 years. Answers were to be yes, no, or I do not know the work. I recorded these answers as they were given. After checking each of the 43 names, I then asked each juror to name others, whom they thought were major scholarly contributors to the field.

In terms of the 43 major contributors to the Handbook, a summary of responses from the panel is as follows:

9 received	10 yes votes
6 received	9 yes votes
6 received	8 yes votes
7 received	7 yes votes
None received	6 yes votes
3 received	5 yes votes
2 received	4 yes votes
3 received	3 yes votes
4 received	2 yes votes
3 received	1 yes vote

When asked to name other major contributors, the 10 jurors named a total of 34 people. Only 11 of these additional people received two or more nominations. Of those 11, eight were on the long list of 223 scholarly contributors but not on the short list of 43 contributors. They probably should have been. Their names are Charles Bidwell, Luvern Cunningham, James Guthrie, Henry Levin, Dan Lortie, David Tyack, Willard Waller, and Frederick Wirt. Three additional people, with multiple nominations by the jury but

recognized hardly at all by the Handbook, were Lyle Johns in finance, Stephen Bailey in politics, and H. Thomas James in finance. I second their nominations by panel members; clearly they have been major scholarly contributors.

Then, I would like to support the nomination of nine additional people, even though nominated by only one panel members, as major scholars in the field. Seven of these nine were on the long list of 223 but did not make the short list. They are Charles Benson in school finance; Raymond Callahan for his Education and the Cult of Efficiency; John Hemphill, as the senior researcher on Administrative Performance and Personality; Christopher Hodgkinson for his two books on the philosophy of administration; James Lipham for a career of research on the principalship; Richard Scott for his Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems; and Karl Weick for his loosely coupled concept.

I also second the single nominations of panel members for two additional scholars even though they did not make the long list of 223. These people are Jean Hills for his conceptual work following Parsons and his many critical reviews of the literature; and Arthur Wise for Rich Schools, Poor Schools, and Legislated Learning.

A look at Table 1 may help us summarize this discussion. Group A, with strong Handbook and strong panel support, numbered 28. I reduced the number to 26 by eliminating John Dewey and Max Weber as contributors of an earlier time. Group B, with strong Handbook support and moderate panel support, numbered five but I reduced it to four by eliminating George Strayer, also an earlier contributor. Group C of eight had moderate Handbook support and moderate panel support. Group D of three was ignored by the Handbook but had

moderate panel support. Group E of seven had moderate Handbook support and modest panel support. Group F of two people was ignored by the Handbook, had only one independent nomination by a panel member, but had my strong support. This gives a total of 50 scholars who, in my view, are major contributors to the field and their names are shown in Appendix B.

TABLE I

RECOGNITION OF MAJOR SCHOLARS IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, 1955-85

GROUP	NUMBER OF SCHOLARS	HANDBOOK ENDORSEMENT	PANEL SUPPORT	CAMPBELL RECOMMENDATIONS
A	26	Strong in 43	Strong 7-10 yes	Strong
B	4	Strong in 43	Moderate 4-5 yes	Strong
C	8	Moderate in 223	Moderate 2 or more nominations	Strong
D	3	Ignored	Moderate 2 or more nominations	Strong
E	7	Moderate in 223	Modest 1 nomination	Strong
F	2	Ignored	Modest 1 nomination	Strong
G	10	Strong in 43	Weak 1-3 yes	Weak

Finally, in Table 1 there is Group G, 10 scholars with strong Handbook endorsement and weak panel support. In my judgment, they may have received more prominence in the Handbook than was their due. Some members of this group are young and may still become worthy of the early recognition bestowed by the Handbook. Frequently, a junior scholar served as the second author of

a chapter in the Handbook. In sum, the Handbook and the panel are in substantial agreement regarding 45 contributors. I have added five contributors that were ignored by the Handbook and have suggested that 10 contributors given strong endorsement by the Handbook have not as yet earned the accolade of major scholars in the field. Agreement on 45 of the 60 contributors, given the crude methods of comparison, may not be a bad score.

Put another way, I reduced the major Handbook contributors of 43 by 13, three because they were contributors at an earlier time, and 10 because they had little panel support. To the remaining 30 major Handbook contributors, I added 20 more, eight of whom had moderate Handbook and moderate panel support, three of whom were largely ignored by the Handbook but had moderate panel support, seven who had moderate Handbook and modest panel support, and two largely ignored by the Handbook, with modest panel support, and my own strong support.

These appraisals of major contributors to the field obviously raise questions about the methods used that support such appraisals. The first device was the extent to which contributors were cited in the Name Index. As noted above, the Name Index did not always include all references listed at the end of chapters. Another limitation of this device was the proclivity of a few authors of chapters to cite generously their own work. Hence, at best, the citation method is a crude measure. The second device employed was the reputational survey. That method, too, has its limitations, particularly in the selection of panel members and the time lag often inherent in reputational responses. One can be a bit more confident about the major contributors when there is some evidence from both of the methods employed, as indeed there was for 45 contributors.

SUMMARY

We return then to our initial question, how well does the Handbook serve its historical mission? With respect to the time dimension, there are two answers. Necessary as the 30 year delimitation seems to have been, the decision may have come at the price of remaining ignorant of much research that was done prior to the 1950s. In terms of the 30 year period, there seems to be some evidence that scholars and their contributions in the early part of the period were sometimes ignored. With respect to research reflecting the major developments in the profession over that period, the record is much more positive.

Regarding how well the Handbook included the major contributors in the field, the document appears to have done well, if not superbly. Some contributors appeared to get less attention than they deserved and a few were ignored completely. Some contributors, often younger members of the profession, seemed to be accorded prominence not yet fully deserved. These remarks suggest that the Handbook is a human document, as good as the circumstances and the people involved could produce, not completely meeting our aspirations but at the same time documenting in very substantial terms who was doing what to advance knowledge in our field over recent years.

REFERENCES

Aikin, W. W., (1942). The Story of the Eight-Year Study. New York: Harper and Bros.

Ayers, L. P., (1917). The Cleveland School Survey--Summary Volume. Cleveland, Ohio: The Cleveland Foundation.

Buckingham, B. R., (1920). "Announcement", Journal of Educational Research, pp. 1-4.

Campbell, R. F. and Gregg, R. T., Editors, (1957). Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Bros.

Campbell, R. F. et al, (1987). A History of Thought and Practice in Educational Administration. New York: Teachers College Press.

Caswell, H. L., (1929). City School Surveys. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Ravitch, D., (1983). The Troubled Crusade--American Education, 1945-1980. New York, Basic Books.

Review of Educational Research. 1(January-December, 1931).

Tyack, D.B. and Hansot, E., (1982). Managers of Virtue--Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980. New York: Basic Books.

3/29/88

APPENDIX A

THE 43 MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THE HANDBOOK

NAME

Abbott, M.G.

Bossert, S.T.

Boyan, N.J.

Boyd, W.L.

Bridges, E.M.

Carlson, R.O.

Charters, W.W.Jr.

Coleman, J.S.

Corbett, H.D.

Corwin, R.G.

Culbertson, J.A.

Dewey, J.

Erickson, D.A.

Firestone, W.A.

Getzels, J.W.

Greenfield, T.B.

Griffiths, D.E.

Gross, N.C.

Guba, E.G.

Halpin, A.W.

Herriott, R.E.

Hoy, W.K.

Iannaccone, L.

Immegart, G.

Johnson, S.M.

Jung, R.K.

Kerchner, C.T.

Kirst, M.W.

March, J.G.

Marshall, C.

Miskel, C.G.

Mitchell, D.E.

Ortiz, F.I.

Parsons, T.

Peterson, P.E.

Pitner, N.J.

Sergiovanni, T.J.

Simon, H.A.

Strayer, G.

Valverde, L.A.

Weber, M.

Willower, D.J.

Wolcott, H.F.

APPENDIX B

A REVISED LIST OF 50 MAJOR SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTORS TO THE FIELD

NAME

Bailey, S. K.

Benson, C. S.

Bidwell, C. E.

Bossert, S. T.

Boyan, N. J.

Boyd, W. L.

Bridges, E. M.

Callahan, R. E.

Carlson, R. O.

Charters, W. W. Jr.

Coleman, J. S.

Corwin, R. G.

Culbertson, J. A.

Cunningham, L. L.

Erickson, D. A.

Firestone, W. A.

Getzels, J. W.

Greenfield, T. B.

Griffiths, D. E.

Gross, N. C.

Guba, E. G.

Guthrie, J. W.

Halpin, A. W.

Hemphill, J. K.

Herriott, R. E.

Hills, R. J.

Hodgkinson, C.

Hoy, W. K.

Iannaccone, L.

James, H. T.

Johns, R. L.

Kirst, M. W.

Levin, H. M.

Lipham, J. M.

Lortie, D. C.

March, J. G.

Miskel, C. G.

Mitchell, D. E.

Parsons, T.

Peterson, P. E.

Scott, W. R.

Sergiovanni, T. J.

Simon, H. A.

Tyack, D.

Waller, W.

Weick, K. E.

Willower, D. J.

Wirt, F. M.

Wise, A. E.

Wolcott, H. G.